## REMARKS

## Introduction And Discussion of Previous Amendment which Was Not Considered

New claims 38-48 have been added to add claims in various formats. Accordingly, Claims 1-48 are now pending.

In a <u>January 16, 2007</u> amendment, each of the independent claims in the then pending set of claims 1-37 was amended in a manner consistent with the agreement reached during a <u>December 14, 2006</u> in person interview discussed below. Accordingly, as amended, claims 1-37 are directed to allowable subject matter. The reasons why the claims are allowable over the applied references are discussed in the January 16, 2007 amendment and therefore will not be repeated again here.

Unfortunately, when issuing the Feb. 5, 2007 final Office Action, the Examiner failed to consider the January 16, 2007 amendment. This is clear from the office action which indicates that it is in response to Applicant's November 16, 2006 communication, not the January 16, 2007 Amendment.

Accordingly, it appears that Applicant's January 16, 2007 amendment crossed in the mail with Feb. 5, 2007 final office action and was not considered.

Applicants' undersigned representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the December 14, 2006

interview. Applicants respectfully submit that upon consideration of the pending claims which include the feature which was agreed to distinguish over the applied reference, that the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn and the application passed to issue.

For a more detailed discussion of the pending claims and why they distinguish over the applied reference the Examiner is referred to the Interview Summary included in the January 16, 2007 amendment.

## II. New Claims 38-48 Are Patentable

New claims 38-39 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

New claims 40-43 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claims 14-17 are allowable.

New claims 44-45 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claims 22-23 are allowable.

New claims 46-48 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claims 24-26 are allowable.

## III. Conclusion

Claims 1-37 are pending. Each of the independent claims ha been amended in a manner that was agreed would overcome the outstanding rejections. Each of the dependent claims is patentable for the same reasons the independent claim from which they depend are patentable. None of the claims are anticipated or

rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance.

If there are any outstanding issues which need to be resolved to place the application in condition for allowance the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by phone to discuss and hopefully resolve said issues. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made and any required fee is authorized to be charged to the deposit account of Straub & Pokotylo, deposit account number 50-1049.

None of the statements or discussion made herein or during the summarized interview are intended to be an admission that any of the applied references are prior art to the present application and Applicants preserve the right to establish that one or more of the applied references are not prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

August 6, 2007

Michael P. Straub, Attorney

Reg. No. 36,941

Tel.: (732) 542-9070